



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,948	12/03/2001	Robert J. Dugan	POU920010169US1	2758

7590
Floyd A. Gonzalez
IBM Corporation
2455 South Road, P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

05/04/2007

EXAMINER

MATTIS, JASON E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,948

Applicant(s)

DUGAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jason E. Mattis

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment After Final filed 4/19/07. Due to the Applicant's evoking of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) regarding the Ratcliff '540 patent, the previous grounds of rejection have been withdrawn; however, after further search new grounds of rejection have been added as shown below. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratcliff et al. '438 (U.S. Pat. 5740438) in view of Lioy (U.S. Pat. 6775553).

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, Ratcliff et al. '438 discloses a method, process, and computer program product stored on a computer readable medium for assigning addresses to a channel adapter in a data processing system including a server, multiple partitions, a fabric, and a channel adapter communicating between the

Art Unit: 2616

partitions and the fabric (See the abstract, column 4 lines 31-65, and Figure 3 of Ratcliff et al. '438 for reference to a method, process, and program stored as software on a computer readable medium for an address assigning method in a system, as shown in Figure 3, including processing system 11, which is a server, multiple partitions 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 21, a host to network interface 67, which is a fabric, and a channel connection 29, which is a connection from a port of a channel adapter of the processing system 11 to the host to network interface 67). Ratcliff et al. '438 also discloses sending multiple requests from the channel adapter to the fabric with each request being sent on behalf of a respective partition (See column 5 lines 24-41 of Ratcliff et al. '438 for reference to partitions of the processing system 11 sending initialization commands, which are requests, to the host to network interface 67, with an initialization command being sent on behalf of each partition respectively). Ratcliff et al. '438 further discloses assigning a unique address identification to each partition for each request, storing the address identifications in a table in the fabric, and returning the assigned address identification for each request with multiple addresses being assigned to the same channel adapter (See column 5 line 53 to column 6 line 35 and Figures 4-5 of Ratcliff et al. '438 for reference to the host to network interface 67 assigning unique addresses to each partition, storing the addresses in a network to host connection table, and returning the assigned addresses for each request with multiple addresses being assigned to each adapter, for example, partitions 2, 3, and 4 each being assigned a unique logical address through the same port 1). Ratcliff et al. does not disclose that each

Art Unit: 2616

request is a request for an address identification to be assigned to a respective partition, assigning a unique address in response to each request, and returning the assigned address for each request.

With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, Liroy, in the field of communications, discloses sending requests for address identifications to be assigned to, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request (See column 3 line 66 to column 4 line 11 of Liroy for reference to at initialization, requesting an IP address in a Configure-Request message and assigning a unique IP address in response to each request where the assigned IP address is returned in a Configure-Ack message). Sending requests for address identifications to be assigned, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request has the advantage of allowing unique IP addresses to be assigned on an as needed basis as they are requested, such that components that do not currently need and IP address do not waste IP address resources that could be used by other components.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Liroy, to combine sending requests for address identifications to be assigned, assigning unique addresses in response to each request, and returning the assigned addresses for each request, as suggested by Liroy, with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. '438, with the motivation being to allow unique IP addresses to be assigned on an as needed basis as they are requested, such

Art Unit: 2616

that components that do not currently need and IP address do not waste IP address resources that could be used by other components.

With respect to claims 2, 7, 12, and 17, Ratcliff et al. '438 discloses establishing the table in the fabric responsive to the first request (See column 5 lines 53-60 of Ratcliff et al. '438 for reference to establishing entries in the network to host connection table responsive to an initialization sequence).

With respect to claims 3, 8, 13, and 18, Ratcliff et al. '438 discloses that the table is stored in a name server in the fabric (See column 4 line 66 to column 5 line 18, column 5 lines 53-60, and Figure 4 of Ratcliff et al. '438 for reference to the table being stored in a memory 83, that acts as a name server in the HNI 67).

With respect to claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, Ratcliff et al. '438 does not disclose sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned.

With respect to claims 4, 9, 14, and 19, Liroy, in the field of communications, discloses sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned (See column 3 line 66 to column 4 line 11 of Liroy for reference to generating and sending a Configure-Request message, which is an address request message including an IP address, and for reference to sending a Configuration-Ack message, which is a message confirming that the address is assigned). Sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned has the advantage of allowing the device that will be using an address to determine its own address based on the device's needs.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Lioy, to combine sending a proposed address in a request and confirming that the proposed address is assigned, as suggested by Lioy, with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. '438, with the motivation being to allow the device that will be using an address to determine its own address based on the device's needs.

4. Claims 5, 10, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratcliff et al. '438 in view Lioy and in further view of Kanemaki et al. (U.S. Pat. 6081845).

With respect to claims 5, 10, 15, and 20, the combination of Ratcliff et al. '438 and Lioy does not disclose sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address.

With respect to claims 5, 10, 15, and 20, Kanemaki et al., discloses sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address (**See column 13 lines 24-32 of Kanemaki et al. for reference to sending a message to update the address of an address already stored in a table**). Sending an updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address has the advantage of allowing devices to notify an address server of an address change so that an address table of the address server has the most up to date address data.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, when presented with the work of Kanemaki et al., to combine sending an

Art Unit: 2616

updated address and updating address data stored with the updated address, as suggested by Kanemaki et al., with the system and method of Ratcliff et al. '438 and Lioy, with the motivation being to allow devices to notify an address server of an address change so that an address table of the address server has the most up to date address data.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Romero et al. (U.S. Publication US 2002/0129127 A1) discloses another system and method where server partitions are assigned unique IP addresses.

7. Applicant's amendment filed 12/7/06 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2616

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason E. Mattis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3154. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jem



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600